UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,204	01/20/2006	Detlef Cieslik	2002P01357WOUS	5186
	7590 12/15/201 PPLIANCES CORPOR	EXAMINER		
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 100 BOSCH BOULEVARD NEW BERN, NC 28562			CIRIC, LJILJANA V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3785	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/15/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

NBN-IntelProp@bshg.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/534,204	CIESLIK ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
LXAIIIIIEI	Artonic	

	Ljiljana (Lil) V. Ciric	3785	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>19 November 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, wwith 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (l	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of the control of the con	•	36(a) and the appropriat	e extension fee
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	hortened statutory period for reply origi	nally set in the final Office	e action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL  2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complete	liance with 27 CED 41 27 must be	filed within two month	of the data of
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the complex of Appeal has been filed.</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
<ul><li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett</li><li>_ appeal; and/or</li></ul>			ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	-
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: none. Claim(s) objected to: 20 and 26. Claim(s) rejected: 16-19,21,23,27-31 and 33-38. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 22,25 and 32.		I be entered and an e:	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			
	/Ljiljana (Lil) V. Ciric/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 3785	

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the rejection of claim 20 as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's arguments filed on 19 November 2010 with regard to the previously cited prior art rejections are not persuasive. In particular, applicant argues that, for example, the Nam et al. reference fails to disclose a sleeve as recited in independent claims 16 and 30 of the instant application; however, the Nam et al. reference clearly discloses an equivalent sleeve or housing (the two terms being synonymous) as explained in greater length in the Final Rejection mailed on October 5, 2010. Applicant's remaining arguments are equally non-persuasive, being based on overly narrow interpretations of the pending claims and of the applied prior art reference, and on elements not recited in the pending claims. Furthermore, applicant's arguments regarding impermissible hindsight are not persuasive either. With regard to hindsight, applicant is respectfully reminded that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See In re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). In this case, the necessary hindsight was not beyond someone of ordinary skill in the art, because it merely involves an obvious rearrangement of parts.

Continuation of 13. Other: The replacement drawing filed on 19 November 2010 is hereby approved.